Files

Open Letters to— Premier Aberhart

By

William Irvine

Price 25 cents

Reproduced from

The People's Weekly

Foreword

Before the last Provincial election in Alberta, Social Credit sounded so good that a majority of the hard pressed debt-burdened people voted for it. Under the circumstances they could hardly be blamed for having done so. Those who could make themselves believe that they would get all that Mr. Wm. Aberhart, B.A., now premier of Alberta, promised to give them, would have been foolish had they not voted as they did. Many who had intellectual difficulties in the way of acceptance voted for Social Credit just as they might have bought a ticket on a sweepstake. Their view was, "we haven't much to lose, no other party has anything to offer and after all, we may win, let's take a chance."

Whether or not the Social Credit party leaders were political racketeers or sincere but ignorant would-be statesmen may never be fully decided. All that can be done is to judge from the promises made and the steps taken toward their fulfillment, up to the time of writing.

The following was the bill of fare offered to the Alberta people:

1. The Provincial government was to take control of public credit regardless of both bank act and constitution and was to "get" money for dividends as well as for all other purposes "where the bankers got it from—the end of a fountain pen", without paying interest and without creating debt.
2. To set up a State Credit House as a necessary part of the mechanism of Social Credit administration. Such an institution to function as a sort of bank.
3. The distribution of "basic dividends" out of the "Social heritage", of from $25.00 to $75.00 per month to every adult citizen of the province.
4. The distribution of sums of money to all children under 21 years of age, which sums would range from $5.00 to $25.00 per month, depending on the age of the individual.
5. To lend money to farmers without interest.
6. To establish new industries in the Province such as textile mills, flour mills, the manufacturing of farm implements etc., with a view to making the Province a self-supporting economic unit.
7. The fixing of a "just price" on all commodities.
8. To end poverty in the midst of abundance.
9. To end unemployment.
10. To increase purchasing power.
11. To reduce taxation.
12. Pledged to call Major Hugh Douglas, author of Social Credit, to direct the whole program.

The government has been only about nine months in office. Even if enumerated promises had been practicable and within the powers of the Provincial government to effect, it is too soon to blame the government

for not bringing such drastic changes on so wide a field in such short time. But it is not too soon to point out that the steps so far taken by the government lead in a direction diametrically opposite to that indicated in its pre-election promises.

The achievements of the government to date are:

1. The engaging of Mr. R. J. Magor, chairman of the Canadian Chamber of Commerce Committee on Sound Finance in Government, and under whose advice an attempt was made to balance the budget through heavily increased taxation.
2. The severance of relations with Major Hugh Douglas through the engaging of Mr. Magor and the adoption of an orthodox financial policy.
3. An increase of over $3,000,000 in taxation, most of which increase was due to a two per cent sales tax which the consumer must pay.
4. A marked reduction in Social Services, particularly in matters of public health, education and seed grain relief to farmers.
5. The passing of a so-called Social Credit measure which contains no specific provisions as to Social Credit except that it provided for the assumption of the powers by the cabinet to take any steps in regard to the matter which it desired, without the necessity of consulting the legislature.
6. The passing of a Recall Act, obviously for political consumption, for it was so drawn as to make recall a practical impossibility.
7. The passing of an act making refunding of the entire provincial debt compulsory. This act to be proclaimed at the will of the Governor-in-Council. The act has not yet been proclaimed.
8. A proposal to issue script, or "certificates" by Order-in-Council with which to pay wages on public works. The cash collected by taxes or received in grants from the Dominion is to be held as a means of redemption of the certificates. But since each certificate is to be taxed 104 per cent by the time it is finally redeemed it constitutes a new tax on the people and will not increase purchasing power.
9. Purchasing power has been definitely decreased through government action.
10. It has been declared that Alberta must live within its financial income with a balanced budget, thus conforming to sound money and repudiating Social Credit.
11. The most extreme partisanship in the history of the Province has been shown in the disregard of the Civil Service. Many competent civil servants have been ruthlessly discharged for no other reason than that a position was required for a Social Credit heeler. Added to this is the threat to restrict the press of the Province for criticizing the government policies.

The open letters compiled in this pamphlet are substantially as they appeared in The People's Weekly. They are being so issued because of the many requests by the general public for the back copies of The People's Weekly containing them. They will indicate the steps away from its promises and toward capitalism as taken by the government and the timely warning given by the C.C.F.

WM. IRVINE.

OPEN LETTERS
. . . . TO THE PREMIER

HON. WM. ABERHART, B.A. January 25, 1936.
Premier of Alberta.

Dear Sir:

I address this letter to you not in your capacity as a private citizen but as Premier of this Province. As such you are the servant of all whether or not subsequent events prove that you are the fittest to serve by being the greatest amongst us. The matters in connection with which I am writing you are of course public and for that reason it is befitting that this letter should be public also.

I want at once to assure you of my very best wishes in the onerous task you have assumed. I quite realize that if you fail we shall all suffer, so that my personal interest as well as the collective well-being will be best served by your success. I want you to believe me when I say that I have no wish to be hypercritical. Your attitude as I have been impressed thereby would seem to indicate that you resent criticism and at once regard your critic as an enemy who seeks only your political downfall.

I know of no man in public life today who has left himself so open to critiscism as you have and who has escaped with so little. You may not have quite realized it, but the promises you made during the election were extremely attractive, inordinately spectacular and perhaps extravagant. Possessing those characteristics they lent themselves easily to criticism and even to ridicule. But neither the press nor the people have been disposed to take advantage of the position. Even those who were driven from public life by your successful election have been silent. The general attitude has been and still is to give you a chance, and to be fair.

I do not desire to take exception to the fact that the $25.00 per month dividend is not yet forthcoming. You asked for 18 months in which to achieve that and I think such was not an unreasonable request. But I would remind you that those starving women and children, those boys and girls who are denied school through poverty over whom you wept so copiously in your home town in Ontario are still suffering notwithstanding your tears. So if you can possibly get the dividend working before the 18 months so much the better.

Now, Sir, having made it clear that I am not one of those who expected to get $25.00 before the 18 month limit I desire to point out certain things which you have done which appear to me to favor the "Big Shots" of whom you had so many uncomplimentary things to say during the years prior to the last Provincial election. Your very first utterance on the night of your election was discouraging. Instead of congratulating the people for having voted for their own emancipation and rejoicing with them that henceforth poverty would be abolished, with abundance of purchasing power distributed to all, including a dividend, what did you say? You forgot all about the people and the good things you promised them and you hastened to assure the Big Shots that their investments and their usury would be safeguarded.

No man in this Province has had more to say about the robbery of the Big Shots than you. No one should know better than you that you cannot be fair to the people and at the same time guarantee the ill-gotten gain of the Big Shots.

During your campaign of the last three years you often met with people who were puzzled over the simplicity of your scheme. They would invariably ask you: "Where will you get the money from?" This question never failed to bring a mocking laugh from you nor did you omit to pour the vials of your scorn upon the unsuspecting heads of your interrogators. But your answer was invariably: "We'll get the money where the bankers get it from —the end of a fountain pen."

What are we to think now? You are reported in the Edmonton Journal of January 13, 1936, as saying: "The Alberta Government has no idea as to where the money can be found if the Dominion Government does not provide it."

I agree with the answer you gave that we should get our money where the bankers get it from. But I told you before you were elected that you had no power as Premier of this Province to get your money from that source. You insisted that you did.

Very well! You are the Premier, why don't you use your power to get money from the same place the bankers get it from? Instead of doing that you go to Ottawa for money from the bankers. You or your associates have been three times to Ottawa begging money from the bankers. Why do that, and spend so much of the public money travelling backward and forward? Why not get your money from the fountain pen? If you have not the power to do so, you were elected under false pretences. If you have the power and have not exercised it you have been false to your trust.

You try to cover up your weakness in this by saying that it is the debts of previous governments that you have had to go to Ottawa about. No one denies that. But what has that got to do with making money or getting money where the bankers get it. If you can get $2,000,000 from where the bankers get it you can use it for any purpose. It is just as easy to get $2,000,000 from where the bankers get it to pay debts of past governments as it will be to get a similar amount to be used by your government to avoid going into debt.

Now, Mr. Premier, this fight with the bankers has got to be made by some one some day. You were elected to do so. So far you have succumbed to them. I urge you to stand firm, make the fight. Even if you lose the fight you will not and cannot lose the principle of justice involved. If you will only exercise that power which you insisted that this Province had, namely, to get the money where the bankers got it, we will stand by you to a man. Even if they use force against you and throw you out of power and put in a receiver to take charge of the Province we will back you up, for in taking a firm stand against the present financial system you will be fighting the greatest battle for the people of which history has any record.

Now, Sir, you have shied away from this fight. True you fight the bankers with your mouth, but you've got to fight them with that fountain pen. It is mightier than the mouth. Use it.

There are other matters of which I shall write to you in subsequent issues of the People's Weekly.

Sincerely yours,

WM. IRVINE.

HON. WM. ABERHART, B.A., February 1, 1936.
Premier of Alberta.

Dear Sir:

In my letter of last week I drew your attention to the fact that so far you have made no effort to get money for Alberta from that source from which the bankers get money. In this letter I want to comment on the "sound basis" which you desire to achieve for Alberta prior to your introduction of Social Credit.

To you must go the credit of having been the only Provincial leader at the last election who properly appreciated the issue in which, above all else the people of Alberta were interested—namely, the inauguration of a new financial system. A system which would secure for the people the use of their own credit without debt-creating consequences, and which would make available for use that abundance of production now denied the people through financial stringency. That was the real issue of the last election and properly so.

The people wanted that new financial system as speedily as possible. Some of us did not think it would be quite so simple to accomplish such an undertaking. We thought that a financial system was a Federal matter. But you—all honor to you—insisted that it was a matter for the Province, and a simple matter; that it was not necessary for the people of Alberta to wait until the people of Quebec and Ontario agreed to accept Social Credit as would have been required had it been a Federal matter. No! You insisted that a new financial policy could and should be put into operation in Alberta forthwith and that you were the one to do it.

I, of course, disagreed with you then and disagree with you now on that point. You were honored with the confidence of the people. But the point at issue still remains in doubt. The only way to settle whether or not a new financial system can be successfully introduced in Alberta is to introduce it. That is the great event for which all are now waiting.

Although disagreeing with you on the point, I want more than anything else in the way of economics or politics to see the establishment of that promised financial system. And this letter is not inspired by any undue impatience on my part to see you get going on it. I want you to have every reasonable consideration. What I am most concerned about at the moment is the method of your approach to your task.

You have declared again and again that you must first put Alberta on a sound financial basis before you can begin your Social Credit system. It is possible that you are really serious in making such a statement. Assuming that you are, I desire to present for your consideration, the situation as I see it.

Presumably you mean by "Putting Alberta on a sound basis" that you desire to refinance maturing obligations and if possible at a reduced rate of interest and also to enforce the Province to live within its financial income by balancing the budget. But do not forget that it was because both these things were regarded as unsound that you were elected. How can you regard refinancing debts by borrowing more money from the "Big Shots" as a "sound basis?" If that is a sound basis then your advent into politics was a mistake. Either Mr. Reid, Mr. Howson or Mr. Duggan could have accomplished that even with greater ease than you. Surely the mountains have not suffered such disturbing travail for so small and ordinary a mouse.

Further, if by the use of the old system you can put Alberta on a sound basis, then there is obviously no need of a new system at all. Most of us hold the view that the introduction of the new financial system is the first step toward achieving a "sound basis" for the Province. But you evidently believe—whether assisted to that view by Mr. Magor or not—that we must first get on a sound basis and then introduce the pen system. I repeat that if you can get the province on a sound basis without introducing a new financial system, then why introduce it? For the desired end will then have been attained without any innovation. Surely you who claim to be gifted with the long range view of a prophet can see further than that.

You will be the first to admit that there is no soundness in the present financial system, that there is nothing in it but wounds and bruises and putrifying sores. How do you expect to arrive at a "sound basis" by the further use of an unsound and unjust system? And yet you can mean nothing else when you declare that you must put Alberta on a sound basis before introducing Social Credit.

Let me put this matter to you frankly in language in which you will not fail to understand my point of view, however much you may then disagree. You are a preacher of the gospel. You are greatly interested in saving souls. Would you advise a sinner to patch up his soul and try to get it on a sound basis before he becomes converted? Or would you advise a drunkard to take another shot of Scotch to put him on a sound basis before you invite him to repent? I do not think you would dream of giving advice to anyone as unsound as that. You would demand an immediate abandonment of the sin by the sinner and urge his acceptance of the new way of life at once as the only way to achieve a sound basis for his life.

Why then do you give such ridiculous advice in respect to a new financial system? The principle is the same. The present financial system is either sound or unsound, it is either right or wrong. If it is a wrong system, as I believe it is and as you have often declared it to be, then why should you want to monkey with it at all. You were elected to give us a new system. Now you say you cannot begin the new system until you have got us a sound basis by the further use of an unsound and wrong system. You surely do not expect to fill the baskets of your promises with grapes and figs from the thorns and thistles of the "Big Shots" system. That is wrong thinking, sir.

I have been led by your many declarations to regard you as a clever and honest man. If you really are clever you will know better than to think that the best way to start a new financial system is to wait until we have achieved a sound basis by the further use of the old one; and since you are honest you will not repeat that foolish and impossible statement.

It may be that I am overestimating your greatness when I assume that you may be great enough to welcome advice even from a source as humble as that of the writer. But if such greatness should be yours, my advice is—don't waste your time trying to put Alberta on a sound basis through the use of an unsound system. Let the "Big Shots" save their own system. Concentrate your efforts upon putting Social Credit into operation and by that method alone to achieve the desired sound basis.

The only "sound basis" for Alberta is to be found by the use of her own credit by herself at cost. The more you borrow from the "Big Shots"

even for refinancing and at a lower interest rate, the more unsound the basis becomes. The periodic reduction of interest rates which follows depressions is merely a necessary adjustment which secures for the "Big Shots" the utmost limit which the traffic in credit can bear. Such a reduction will come from the "Big Shots" in their own interests. It is necessary to bleed the patient scientifically—that is to bleed him today so that he may be bled again tomorrow, but on no account to bleed the patient to death. A sound basis of interest rates according to orthodox finance is the scientific bleeding of the people so that they may continue to live and to bleed some more.

This "sound basis" which you desire to achieve before you begin your financial reforms implies a balanced budget. You have declared your aim to be a balanced budget. What better or more befitting aim could be entertained even by St. James Street?

A balanced budget means the curtailment of public services in accordance with artificial financial limitations and the ignoring of the fact of abundance. This is the very antithesis of the financial policy to which you professed to subscribe during the election campaign. That basis, while considered "sound" by the "Big Shots" is considered unsound by the people of Alberta.

It is true that if you are going to continue under the old financial system that you must balance the budget. If you do not do so Mr. Magor won't lend you any more money. If he does not lend you any more then you cannot go on any longer on the old basis. Now sir, I believe I saw the old black cat jump out of the bag right there. Can it be that you have been brought to realize that you have not the power as you thought you had to introduce into Alberta fundamental changes in the financial system, but that you have not frankly acknowledged to the people the lesson which Mr. Magor was sent by the bankers to teach you. I suspect that that is the actual situation. Time will tell.

Meanwhile Mr. Premier do not forget that it is better to die trying, than to die for not trying. It will be more glorious to you and more serviceable to the people for you to die nobly fighting the bankers, than like some of your predecessors to die fighting for the bankers. But if you intend to choose the higher way you cannot afford to bend to balanced budgets and sound basis. You must bring on your new system.

Sincerely yours,
WM. IRVINE.

HON. WM. ABERHART, B.A., February 8, 1936.
Premier of Alberta.

Dear Sir:

There are a few people in this Province—those who live by interest—who are afraid that you may fight the present financial system. I am one of those who pay interest and therefore my fear is that you are not going to fight the system.

Up to the present time at least, those who live by interest have found you an easy victim. So much so that if you continue as you are going until the conclusion of your term of office as Premier, this province will not only be more in debt, it will be tied hand and foot to the bondholders.

Almost your first act as Premier was a major blunder. You engaged Mr. Robert James Magor as financial advisor even though the government already had under contract as its advisor, Major Hugh Douglas. The former is a representative of the bondholders and a firm advocate of the soundness of the present debt-creating financial system, while the latter is the enemy of the present system and author of Social Credit. What was the reasoning which led you as a Social Credit Premier to select Mr. Magor?

This action on your part was baffling no less to your many friends than to your opponents. St. James Street chuckled and bondholders everywhere heaved a sigh of relief.

If you are a holder of bonds and of certain severe and exacting mortgages, as I am informed you are, then I can understand how Mr. Magor would appeal to you much more readily than he would for instance to those who must pay interest on the bonds and mortgages which you hold. I can understand how you as a bondholder would find an affinity in Mr. Magor, how you might have been drawn toward him by a sort of protective or filial influence both subtle and alluring. But I cannot imagine a man of your astuteness engaging Mr. Magor in the expectation of obtaining assistance from him which would facilitate the Social Credit experiment for which you were elected. For Mr. Magor is the chairman of an organization which exists for no other purpose than to destroy all experiments or innovations of the character you proposed in your election speeches.

Let me put the position to you in another way. Suppose Mr. Magor had been Premier of Alberta and you had been a Social Credit expert as Mr. Magor is a private credit expert, do you think that he would have engaged you as his advisor? How then shall we understand your action in engaging Mr. Magor? Are you satisfied to continue the private credit system for which he stands or did you really not know any better?

Mr. Robert James Magor is President of the National Steel Car Corporation; President of the Magor Car Corporation; Chairman of Ocean Agencies Ltd.; Director of the Canadian Arena Company and of American Railway Car Institute. But the position he holds as the **chairman of the Montreal Branch of the Executive Council on Sound Financing in Government** is the significant one so far as his advice to you is concerned. That body which Mr. Magor now serves in his capacity as financial advisor to the Alberta government is sponsored by the Canadian Chamber of Commerce.

The outstanding achievement in the career of Mr. Magor so far was his giving away the petroleum resources of Newfoundland to the Imperial Oil Company and reducing a self-governing state to the indignity of being governed by a commission appointed by the government of another land.

The essence of the financial deal by which Mr. Magor arranged for the payment of the interest on the national debt of Newfoundland was that the Imperial Oil Company should subscribe $1,750,000 to a national bond issue and in return the Oil Company received a monopoly of the entire petroleum resources of the Island. In other words he traded the natural resources of that country to the Imperial Oil Company. The said company bought bonds for a sum sufficient to pay the interest due to Mr. Magor's bondholders. But what did the people get out of this deal? They lost their resources and when the Imperial Oil Company has exploited

those resources the people will still have to pay the Oil Company the amount subscribed for bonds with interest thereon. Does Alberta want a deal of that sort?

Now Mr. Premier, you may have had nothing in mind when you engaged Mr. Magor, but it is certain that he and the "Midas" club of St. James Street did have something very definitely in mind when they negotiated the arrangement.

You perhaps were not quite responsible at the moment. That is, you were wallowing in the seventh heaven of delight over your political victory when you took that first Eastern trip. You reminded me sir, if you will pardon what may appear an almost vulgar illusion when applied to your own very sedate and proper person—of a pig's bladder filled with wind and responsive to every air current, but lacking the power of self-direction. Mr. Magor and his associates were waiting for you. They caught you on the bounce, with the result that Alberta is now under the direction of the bondholders' representative whose first duty will be to protect the bondholders.

Is there any room to doubt that the advice of Mr. Magor will be inspired by the financial interests he represents? His first move was to obtain the backing of the Dominion for Alberta bonds, thus to doubly insure his clients whom he serves now in his capacity as your advisor. This move involved the proposal to set up a National Loan Council, which when functioning will supervise all provincial expenditures and virtually take out of the hands of the provincial government the power to make its own expenditures at will. Has any premier ever capitulated so completely to the financial magnates?

Mr. Magor will advise: balancing the budget at the expense of public service; that interest be paid before the building of schools or highways; that taxes must be increased to pay the bondholders interest even though children go undernourished and poorly clad.

That, sir, was the sort of advice which you sought.

Sincerely yours,
WM. IRVINE.

HON. WM. ABERHART, B.A., February 15, 1936.
Premier of Alberta.

Dear Sir:

You have not been quite frank with the people in regard to your failure to call Major Douglas to assist you in drafting Social Credit legislation. Various enquiries have been made of you at different times. You have skated around the question and not too gracefully, taking the corners at times in a distinctly amateurish fashion.

You have striven on all occasions to leave the impression with the public that you wanted Major Douglas to come. You even endeavored to feign surprise that he had not arrived. And when Major Douglas protests that he has not been invited you pose in profound amazement and say: "There must be some mistake."

But what was the mistake? And who made it? There is no excuse for a mistake in a simple matter of that sort. Can't you write a letter or telegram that can be understood by Major Douglas? If you can't there

must be something seriously wrong with you. Or if it is not possible to get Major Douglas to understand by letter and telegram that you want him here, then there must be something seriously the matter with him.

It is to be hoped that all correspondence between any member of the Alberta Government and Major Douglas will be tabled early in the coming session. An examination of such letters and telegrams should reveal which of the two made the mistake, if one were made, or which of the two was incapable of understanding.

Of course you know that you sent a word of mouth message with the Dean of Canterbury—a message which you thought advisable not to put in writing. Meanwhile Major Douglas is not here and he most certainly should be here.

Now, Mr. Premier, is the following not the true picture? Major Douglas knowing that it is impossible for any government to take advice from him and Mr. Magor at the same time, refused to play second fiddle. Mr. Magor wants to protect the present financial system. Major Douglas wants to introduce a new system, believing that the old system is not only wrong, but that it cannot safely be kept in operation. If this is the situation, then you and you alone are responsible for the fact that Douglas is not on the job.

You would be the first among Albertans to roll your eyes and thunder out—"Ye cannot serve God and Mammon." The whole province says, "Amen" to that. You cannot serve the bondholders by taking advice from Mr. Magor and at the same time serve the people by taking advice from Major Douglas.

Of course, I expect you will try to save your face—if not your soul—by calling Major Douglas in after Mr. Magor is finished. By that time, however, Mammon—your first love—will have become so well established that it will be too late to do the little that might have been done. In other words if Mr. Magor succeeds in obtaining Federal guarantee for the debts of Alberta not only will he thereby protect the bondholders but he will give the Dominion government an excuse as well as a right to interfere in Provincial affairs. Such interference will be, of course, ostensibly to protect the credit for which the Dominion government will become responsible under the major proposal. There you have the objective of Mr. Magor and the sound government financing group which is backing him.

If and when Mr. Magor succeeds in his scheme, you will then invite Major Douglas to come. There will be no ambiguity about the invitation then, and Major Douglas will have no difficulty whatever in understanding it. By that time he will probably have to refuse to come. He cannot be expected to jeopardize a world movement to the service of which he has given a considerable portion of his life, just to have his fingers burned trying in vain to pull your political chestnuts out of the fire. Of course you will then try to unload on him the blame for your failure. But let me warn you now that if you fail the blame will be on yourself for having engaged Mr. Magor instead of Major Douglas.

Why not give up Mr. Magor at once? "Look not upon the bondholder when he is opulent and optimistic, for at the last he biteth like a serpent and stingeth like an adder."

Mr. Magor's presence has not improved the financial status of Alberta. Saskatchewan, while in a worse financial position than Alberta, managed

to retire $3,000,000 of maturing bonds last week without any assistance from the Dominion government. Alberta can't get $3,000,000 without a Dominion guarantee. Why?

Because you have published it abroad that you are going to start a new financial system. Now I have no quarrel with you about that except that you have only published your intention but made no start toward it. But the point is that it is because of that announced intention that you have trouble in borrowing.

But you should not have to borrow from the bondholders. You should use all that provincial credit that you and Mrs. Rogers talked so much about last summer, and meanwhile send Mr. Magor back to St. James Street where he belongs.

As I see you now you are trying to ride two horses at once and you look a pathetic figure with one leg over Social Credit and the other over Usury. These nags cannot go parallel. Already they begin to change their direction leaving you dangling inelegantly not to say precariously. You had better decide quickly which of the two you intend to come in on. If you don't decide quickly you won't come in on either.

Sincerely yours,
WM. IRVINE.

HON. WM. ABERHART, B.A., February 22, 1936.

Premier of Alberta.

Dear Sir:

Recent occurrences point so directly to a confirmation of my views on why you did not immediately on being elected invite Major Douglas to come to Alberta, that I desire to write you further on the matter even though it was the subject of my last communication.

Major Douglas knew very well that efforts were being made at Ottawa to still further secure the already well nigh impregnable position of the financiers; he knew the bondholders were using the straightened financial position of the provinces as a means of extending their control and of insuring their collections of interest and debt; he knew that Mr. Magor is the go-between of St. James Street and yourself; he had a good reason to know that the Liberal government is, both by dependence and conviction, the servant of "sound money", and he also knew that the proposal to amend the B.N.A. Act so as to give the Federal government power to control the expenditure of provinces borrowing from it, emanated from the bondholders and was promoted by Mr. Magor. It was therefore his duty as an expert under contract to the Alberta government to advise that government in respect to these matters.

Major Douglas did not neglect his duty. He advised the proper authorities. He advised you, Sir. But after having given you his advice, what was he to think or do, when he found that you as a professed Social Crediter and the responsible representative of the Alberta people, had agreed to the Ottawa proposal in the very teeth of his advice?

Knowing these things in his capacity as advisor to the province and finding that you had flouted his advice privately given, what else could Major Douglas do than take the matter over your head to the public who were paying him for just such advice? Not only had you ignored his advice, you had deliberately selected as your advisor in these matters the representative of the bondholders in the place of Major Douglas.

Then what happened? Mr. Duggan, leader of the Conservative party, rose in the Legislature and demanded some sort of censure of Major Douglas. You at once rose and agreed that Mr. Duggan's point was well taken and you refer Major Douglas' statements to the committee on privileges for investigation.

Now, Sir, when Major Douglas signed that contract with the Alberta government, did he thereby yield his freedom to make an observation publicly, such as he did make in respect to financial policy? If by making such a statement he either violated his contract or his implied obligation as a civil servant, he nevertheless did more good for Social Credit thereby than you and Mr. Duggan will both together do if you should succeed in preventing him from making similar statements in the future. Douglas believes in Social Credit and holds that it is better to come to an open break with the bondholders at once, while we have still a little liberty left, than to sacrifice our last vestige of power in a vain effort to prevent that break which must inevitably come.

May I remind you, Sir, that Major Douglas furnished you with the idea which put you in your present position of power. Perhaps, as it turned out, the idea was better for getting power, than for holding it after you have got it. Be that as it may, his prestige as a British economist and the assurance given by yourself that he would be called in to direct the implementing of his own idea, were powerful factors in securing your success at the polls.

It is true, too, that you misunderstood and grievously distorted the Douglas idea. But he bore with that and resisted all pressure to expose you, believing as he did that you would keep your promise and put him in charge of the Social Credit experiment. What irony! He must now behold a Social Credit government under the direction of an expert of the "sound money" error.

Now, Mr. Premier, I congratulate you on the stand you took for government ownership of the telephone system. But that is a small matter in comparison with the financial issue. The success of any government-owned public service depends in large part upon financial control. You must know that. Why then do you waver on the fringe of so great an opportunity? Your antics bring to mind H. G. Wells' description of Lord Northcliffe as "a large bumble bee puzzled by a pane of glass."

Both the budget-balancing policy and the Loan Council proposal of Mr. Magor have in view the payment by the people of the interest and debts owing to the bondholders. Do you not believe that the money which is represented by our public debt was created "by a pen"—"figures in a book"—"an accountancy system?" If so, why do you declare that you intend to honor and to pay such debts?

If it is true, Mr. Premier, that the bankers and bondholders have "created out of nothing", or which is more correct, created on the strength of our real wealth, all the money represented in our public debt, then it

is morally wrong to pay such debts. It is wrong to tax the poor people in order to pay back to bondholders the money which, when created by a fountain pen on the strength of our provincial credit, was called debt and said to belong to those who used the fountain pen. The money which was created by these privileged financiers to get us into debt was created on the credit of the people of Alberta. It was, therefore, the people's money to begin with. It is wrong, therefore, according to Social Credit principles, to recognize that debt, or to compel a distraught people to pay it.

Surely you can do no wrong.

Sincerely yours,
WM. IRVINE.

HON. WM. ABERHART, B.A., February 29, 1936.
Premier of Alberta.

Dear Sir:

Last Saturday the press carried figures from a projected budget which was prepared by the provincial auditor as requested by your advisor, Mr. Magor.

Those figures show, Sir, that you, the Hon. Wm. Aberhart, B.A., and head of the Alberta government proposes to pay to bondholders this year $8,365,089 in interest and $988,950 for other debt charges. The total estimated revenue is $19,783,722 and $24,454,992 is required for the current year, leaving a deficit to be added to the public debt of $4,671,170.

The interest on the debt plus other debt charges amount to $9,354,-039, or nearly half of the entire provincial revenue. This is astounding.

Of course the actual budget has not yet been brought down. It is possible that both the figures and your financial policy will be altered. But having regard to who your advisor is I feel pretty certain that there will be no appreciable alteration in policy and that you will undertake to collect in taxes from the people of Alberta that enormous figure of $9,-354,039 for the bondholders.

The astounding thing about all this is not the enormous interest bill (for what else could it be under all the circumstances?), but Mr. Magor's idea of balancing a budget, and your apparent acquiescence in his St. James Street inspired policy.

Do you sir, of all men, contend that the paying in interest of half the annual revenue of the province to the "Big Shots", the curtailment of public services and the increasing of taxation are fitting policies for a Social Credit premier? Do you really think that the budget should be balanced in that way? And is this what you mean by your talk of "putting Alberta on a sound basis?"

If you are thinking that way now you have either changed your mind since the election or else you were not sincere in your declared intentions at that time. You shouted on the 14th of September, 1934, from your pulpit in Calgary, "Why should not the authorities of Alberta advance the credit themselves? The only answer to this question is that the present government in our country is a government of effete politicians and not of capable vigorous statesmen." Surely that isn't the only answer to the question now, or is it?

Then do you remember May 14, 1935? You were answering a question over the radio. Your righteous indignation was electric when you said: "O goodness! Do they suppose that I should be in favor of taxing the poor to give to the rich?" But what else will you be doing, if you raise over nine million dollars by taxation and pay it out to the "Big Shots" for interest?

On April 19, 1935, you said, after having exhorted your listeners to be true to Social Credit principles: "Would you be pleased if I hobnobbed with the opposers of Social Credit? How would you like it if I sold out to the opposite ranks and I said I needed the cash, would you forgive me?"

Was that one of your prophetic utterances, or just a convenient hypothesis? Is Mr. Magor not the opposer of Social Credit? And are you not hobnobbing with him now?

If taking nine million dollars in taxes from the poor people of Alberta and paying it to the "Big Shots" is what you mean by "putting Alberta on a sound basis," then we didn't need you, for Alberta has always been on that basis. What are we to think of your hiring Mr. Magor to keep us on that basis after you had been elected by the people expressly to put Alberta on an entirely different basis, and given a larger salary than Mr. Magor's fee for doing it?

You should know that any government with sufficient gall and disregard for the sufferings of the people can balance the budget and pay tribute to the "Big Shots." But what government which is free from St. James Street influence would be callous enough to strive for a balanced budget in Alberta at the present time?

Now I fully expect you to tell me that you did not incur these debts upon which you propose to continue to pay interest. I know you did not. But what difference does that make? The Social Credit party is the third to govern Alberta. The Liberal party was the first. They borrowed money and taxed the people to pay interest. The U.F.A. party followed. They borrowed more money and collected taxes to pay interest not only on what they borrowed, but on what the Liberals borrowed also. Then your party comes along, borrows some more money and taxes the people to pay interest on what all three parties have borrowed. Your party is doing just what the others did.

The U.F.A. and the Liberals did not know any better of course. They followed the old path of "sound money", conscientiously and of necessity. You would have admitted that yourself a few months ago. But it is different with you, or at least you managed to convince a large majority of the people that it was. You know better. The people took you at your own estimate. They elected you to stop the St. James Street policy, the policy of the "Big Shots".

Is it true, Sir, that the money which now represents our public debt was created by the "Big Shots" with a fountain pen, or were you just raving when you expresed that view? These "Big Shots" are either our benefactors or they are our plunderers. If, as you insisted during the election, the "Big Shots" created with a fountain pen the money Alberta borrowed from them, they are plunderers if they now charge us $9,354,039 annually for doing that.

Just to refresh your memory. You said on November 9, 1934, over CFCN: "Shall I say then that the financiers were actually able to create money by a bookkeeping entry? We propose the same today for the citizens of Alberta."

Isn't it plundering Alberta to charge us over nine million a year for a bookkeeping entry? And if you help them to collect that plunder what will that make you?

It is sheer confiscation, Sir, for you to squeeze over nine million dollars each year out of the hard pressed farmers and working people of this province to give to the "Big Shots" for having obliged us with a bookkeeping entry. My God, man, how can you do it?

It was to get away from that species of confiscation that the people swarmed to your support. They were right, a thousand times right, when they voted for a new financial system, but I fear they were wrong when they selected you to bring it about.

I write to urge you to change your course now, if indeed it is not already too late. "Choose ye this day whom you will serve". God and the people, or the devil and the financiers. If you choose the former course you will stop paying interest. If the latter, you will retain the item in your budget.

Now, Sir, I do not wish you to construe this letter as destructive criticism and I therefore state now what I think you should do. I suggest that if you can create money as the bankers do, to do it at once and create enough to enable the people of the province to pay their taxes. I fear, however, that you haven't got the power to do so. The fact that you are trying to collect nine million dollars for the "Big Shots" rather hints that they have the power. But if you can't create the money you can refuse to pay any interest at all and concentrate your energies on improving the lives of the people. If you stop paying interest you would have four million of a surplus next year instead of that much of a deficit. And it is no worse for Alberta to default on interest than it was for Germany, France and Great Britain to default to the United States. It must inevitably come to that. You can save the people of this province a great deal of unnecessary suffering by bringing the matter to a head at once. That takes courage and you have lots of that.

On April 14, 1935, you said over CFCN: "I have gradually imbibed that Canadian courage that impels us to stand for right no matter what happens. If I go down I shall go down with my face to the foe and not be running." (Applause.)

What a man you were then! Is it "right" to take the money required by the people for existence and pay it to the "Big Shots" for making a bookkeeping entry? It is not and you know it. Where then is your "face"? Why don't you take your "stand"? Bring on your "Canadian courage". Methinks thou art running.

Sincerely yours,
WM. IRVINE.

HON. WM. ABERHART, B.A., March 7, 1936.
Premier of Alberta.

Dear Sir:

I begin this letter to you, fittingly I think, with a quotation from a great speech from the great Lincoln, to whom one of your followers inappropriately likened you:

"Passion has helped us, but can do so no more. It will in the future be our enemy. Reason must furnish all the material for our future support and defence."

For many years I have been an advocate of monetary reform. My interest in the issue and my sincere hope that you would succeed in your undertaking prompted me to write you this series of letters.

Knowing, as I have had ample opportunity to do, the wiley tactics of the financiers, to which all preceding governments have succumbed, and realizing the powers which they could and would wield against a man in your position, I wrote to warn you before you fell into their trap. I warned your predecessors with whom I was privileged on rare occasions to sit in conference. Not having that relationship with you, I had no other recourse but by public correspondence.

My letters have been as frank as the issue and circumstance required, and at times there may have been barbs on my criticism. But I have no apology, the issue, involving as it does the welfare of all, is greater than any individual.

You are now in the web of that clever spider Magor. If you ever get out again you will be lucky. Newfoundland is still in it.

Your increase in taxation reduces purchasing power correspondingly. You have increased taxation by $3,570,000. Figuring the loss of purchasing power in the same way that you figured the gain when you said that $10,000,000 would pay $120,000,000 in dividends, you have reduced the purchasing power of the people by your new and increased taxes by $35,700,000. You know that the people voted for you in the hope that you would fulfil your promise to increase purchasing power. You have deliberately reduced it, and all for the purpose of paying interest to the bankers.

But you have not only disregarded the inability of the people to pay the financiers' tax, your sheep-like following of Mr. Magor has led you into a position in which your budget can be balanced only by refunding at a maximum rate of three per cent, and that refunding can be effected only by federal backing, while that backing can be got only by yielding to the proposed loan council at Ottawa, provincial control over expenditure.

The Provost Social Credit Group were aware of the danger. They warned you by resolution against that danger. You ignored their warning and told them "not to talk so much." But they had a right to talk, they talked at the right time and in the right way. They prefaced their resolution by a pledge of support. Ninety per cent of us would have supported you if you had led the fight against our real enemies. You are now in the enemy's camp. The hostages which you propose to give them to keep the peace must be wrung from the blood and sweat of an oppressed people.

Now Major Douglas has resigned. I warned you that your action would force him to do so. Your lack of frankness in the Douglas affair will now be understood by everyone. You refused to table the correspondence which would have revealed the true state of affairs. The reason of your refusal is now clear. It was to save your own skin a few days longer and not to protect state secrets. In the future you should study Milton on "Truth and Freedom." He says, "A state governed by the rules of justice and fortitude, cannot suppress knowledge and new light."

Though refusing to table the correspondence you did not hesitate to refer in public to certain of your own communications and to use them

in such a way as to leave the impression that the blame for the fact that Major Douglas was not here was in some way due to him and not to you. In view of the advice you seek and take, I have no hesitation in accepting Major Douglas' word in preference to yours and will risk the outcome when all the facts are eventually brought to light.

The resignation of Major Douglas is the beginning of your downfall. I am sorry, not for you personally so much, as for the people who trusted you and will not only be disappointed but who have been bound more tightly by your hands to a debt-creating financial system. Instead of you being as you represented yourself to be—the deliverer of the people—you are their betrayer. You have set back monetary reform for many years. This is a tragedy.

Sincerely yours,
WM. IRVINE.

HON. WM. ABERHART, B.A., March 14, 1936.
Premier of Alberta.

Dear Sir:

I must write to you about the bill now before the Assembly, the one cited as the "Social Credit Measures Act."

This bill does credit to your genius as a showman, but it provides no Social Credit. I have often intended to congratulate you on your showmanship. You are a wonder really. Barnum was a mere amateur in comparison. And if you will pardon a little gratuitous advice I would suggest that showmanship is your forte. You are far better fitted to bring the mob to the circus than you are at initiating a new policy or governing a province. It is a pity that such a nice round peg as you are should be wobbling so insecurely in a square hole. It is an insult to your genius. You should get out of that predicament as soon as possible. The circus is a "better 'ole." You should stick to it.

But this bit of advice is "on the side" so to say. Let's to the bill in question.

Your bill divides itself naturally into two parts, namely the whereases and the enactments, the whereases predominating. Just to keep the whole matter in view I shall summarize both.

The whereases are—that production is unlimited, that unemployment proves the lack of money, that production by machinery has created a new problem of abundance, that people are entitled to the benefits of abundance, that people are favourable to Social Credit, and that a Social Credit measure should be fitted to the circumstances.

I think you might have added one or two more whereases, such as, whereas the Rocky Mountains still tower above the western plains, and whereas the weather during the present winter has been very severe, and whereas the millennium is weary of leg and slow of foot, etc., etc. But on the whole I have seen lots of bills that were not nearly as well whereased as yours.

The enactments are as follows:

(1) The act is to be cited as the "Social Credit Measures Act." (This clause is indispensable, since otherwise no one would have ever guessed that it was.)

(2) Backs up one of the whereases that the people are "entitled to benefits."

(3) Appoints persons—(a) to "consider", "investigate" and to "formulate"; (b) to enquire into and investigate business.

(4) Appointments are to be made and remunerated by the Lieutenant-Governor.

(5) Witnesses may be compelled to appear.

(6) They may be examined on oath.

(7) Declares elaborately that what can't be done shan't be done.

(8) Shall come into force when passed by the Assembly.

Here again I think there might have been one other section providing for the payment of $25.00 per month to every bona fide citizen. But still the omission of a small matter of that sort will not seriously impair the obvious intent of the measure.

Now, Mr. Premier, you believe in the soul. You spent a lot of time trying to save your own, therefore you will not object to me bringing before you the very naked soul of your so-called "Social Credit Measures Act."

The soul of your bill is as follows:

Whereas the Social Credit party undertook to begin a new financial system by which every bona fide citizen was to have $25.00 per month; and whereas the said party leaders having bowed to the will of the "Big Shots" to balance the budget cannot produce the said $25.00 per month; and whereas the government has no power to do the thing; and whereas they do not know how even if they had the power.

Now, therefore, His Majesty, by the urgent wish and unsolicited consent of the Social Credit government hereby enacts as follows:

(1) This act shall be known as the "Bogus" Social Credit Act.

(2) It shall be quoted by every member of the government and every M.L.A. on every platform as a substitute for the promised cash and must be quoted with a deep quiver in the voice and with fear and trembling.

(3) The consciousness that this measure is a rock shall not prevent any one from making it appear as much as possible like a loaf of bread.

(4) To appoint persons to jobs, which jobs shall be executed by bona fide Social Crediters 100%. Whereas, moreover and likewise, the "job" is to "consider", "investigate", and "formulate" the thing which the Social Credit leaders were so cock-sure about before the election, and the duty of such appointed persons shall also be to find the safest and sleekest ways and means of telling the people that the "rapture" of the $25.00 must be postponed.

(5) That this act shall for political reasons come into force at once so as to indicate the progress made upon the road to nowhere.

The only little bit of sense in all the palaver of your Whereassing Bill is that a commission is to be appointed to investigate whether or not Social Credit is practicable in the province. Do you think that is fair? Did not the leader of the Liberal Party put such an investigation in his platform? Did not you laugh and mock at the Liberal leader who promised only investigation? You knew. You were ready for action at once, weren't you?

Some people think and do not talk. Some think first and then talk. Some talk first and never think. Some talk first and think later. You seem

to be one of a kind entirely out of the ordinary. You talk first and talk long and loud, and then you hire someone at the public's expense to think for you. That is not statesmanship. You wouldn't like it if I told you exactly what that is.

Sincerely yours,
WM. IRVINE.

HON. WM. ABERHART, B.A., March 21, 1936.
Premier of Alberta.

Dear Sir:

Your engaging of Mr. Magor and your ditching of Douglas, your increasing of taxation and your reducing of the purchasing power of the people in order to balance your budget, and the likelihood of your succumbing to the Loan Council at Ottawa are all very disappointing to the people. Your declaration made from your pulpit last Sunday to the effect that while the debts could not be paid that there would be no repudiation of them was the most discouraging of all. That declaration made in all the solemnity which religious fervor can summon suggests that not only you, but also your god is on the side of the bankers. You should be more careful. The people of Alberta will not worship a god who backs up the bankers. If you and he do not repudiate bankers, the people will ultimately repudiate both of you. The true God would surely repudiate burdens of public debt so unjustly laid upon the backs of the people.

The recognition of debts, created by fountain pens, as a sacred obligation, is to condone and maintain the criminal debt-creating system by which the bankers hold the people in slavery. And this is exactly what you have done. Then to add insult to injury you, as a hot gospeller, have the nerve to suggest that Jesus, who died for the people, would take the bread out of the hungry mouths to pay tribute to injustice. You did not say that in so many words, and I am sure you cannot believe it, but when you stand in your pulpit on Sunday and recognize unjust debts as sacred obligations, that is what is implied.

If you stand for the recognition of the public debt as a sacred obligation, and you increase taxes, as you have done, to pay the interest on it, in what way are you fighting the bankers? You talk of "fighting." Who are your enemies? Certainly not the bankers, while you follow a policy of that sort.

Is it not so, Mr. Premier, that your immediate necessity for money determines your action? You must have money as you have said to pay your civil servants every two weeks. "Where is this money to come from?" It would appear that this sinister question is now troubling you quite as much as you thought it troubled the people during the last election when you mocked every one who dared to ask the question.

Now you must either create money yourself, or borrow money from those who do create it, or you must do without money. But you have declared that you can't do without money. You have shown that you either can't or won't create it. What else then is there for you to do but to go to the bankers and get them to create money for you?

Confession is good for the soul, Mr. Premier. Why not openly acknowledge that you are compelled by all the circumstances to do as your predecessors did and as we told you before the election that you would do?

Since you must have money and since you can't create it, you must cowtow to those who do create it. Therefore, you must talk of "sacred obligations" or you won't get any money. Is that the truth? If it is, say so. We will all forgive you for making a mistake, but who could ever forgive you if you have the power, which you claimed before the election that this province had, and have failed to use it in the interests of the people?

To borrow more money from the Big Shots to pay the debts of the Big Shots is what has always been done. That means collection of more interest from the poor people by the Big Shots for the Big Shots. You must either keep on doing this or start a new system. You can't start a new system in Alberta especially if you regard the debts of the old system as a sacred obligation. As Premier of Alberta you must either carry on a government of the Big Shots, by the Big Shots, and for the Big Shots, or else you must repudiate both the Big Shots and the unjust debts they created. If you had the power you thought you would have, you could have paid the debts by the same means by which they were created and avoided repudiation. But as things are, you must either carry on the old system you were elected to overthrow, or you must repudiate.

You have not even begun a new system. You declare against repudiation. What is the alternative? The alternative is the repudiation of the people of Alberta. You have not hesitated to repudiate them. You have repudiated youth by denying them life and opportunity in order that a criminal banking system may be held as a sacred obligation; you have repudiated the aged by giving to the bankers as interest the money which should have gone as dividends to the old people who have built up the country; you have repudiated every family in Alberta by taxing them more in order to maintain the sacred obligation to the bankers.

You have undertaken to pay the bankers their interest and to support their system. What have you done for the people? You tell the people the story of the Red Sea. You tell them that you can't help them, that help "must come from on high," and you command them to "stand still and see the salvation of the Lord."

But why "stand still?" Why not go up and possess the land? There are many more passages of scripture which could be more fittingly applied to the present situation than the "standing still" command. That suits the bankers admirably, no doubt. But the people have stood still long enough. They are tired of your Red Sea economics. They want to go in and possess the land.

Sincerely yours,
WM. IRVINE.

HON. WM. ABERHART, B.A., March 28, 1936.
Premier of Alberta.

Dear Sir:

The most important occurrence since my last letter to you was your amendment to the Social Credit Bill. The disappointment of the people with that bill in its original form, when there was nothing in it, could hardly equal their dismay at the "something" which your amendment added.

You are temperamentally a Fascist and your life's training as a school teacher has developed that tendency. No doubt you are unaware of this

weakness and will probably resent being told about it. As a school principal you said to that child "go" and he went and to another "come" and he came. You were the master among children.

You still think you are the master. You began by saying to civil servants "go" and they went, and to your political friends "come" and they came. We have been so accustomed to that sort of dealing on the part of governments that your discharging of competent civil servants was taken as a matter of course. Some of those discharged, it is true, had twenty-one years of honest and efficient service behind them. They had risen to positions of responsibility step by step and their salaries had been raised as they advanced. You disregarded all merit and put inexperienced office seekers in the place of competent officials and gave your novices the same salary to begin with that those displaced had risen to after many years of service.

In act two, however, your fascism was more daring. The leaders of the two parties had asked that the correspondence between you and Major Douglas should be brought down. That correspondence dealt with public business. As representatives of the people, Mr. Duggan and Mr. Howson were within their rights in asking for it. Moreover, it has been a long standing practice in all British parliaments to table such correspondence on the request of members of the assembly. But you flatly and stubbornly refused. Again you exhibited the pedagogical trait of external discipline. You stood up the three refractory boys, Duggan, Howson and Van Allen in the corner with their faces to the wall and told them to look at the corner until it pleased your fascistic majesty to release them. But when you did that, you must realize that you also stood up the whole population of Alberta in the same corner with the party leaders, and all with their faces to the wall while you gloat in the ecstasy of your little brief authortiy.

In act three your fascism is still more clearly revealed. In your amendment to the Social Credit Bill you take to yourself that power and authority which properly belongs to the Legislature and thereby have robbed the people of a liberty for which other generations fought and paid dearly in the past.

You may argue that any policy within the jurisdiction of the province which the government might bring before the Legislature, your majority would vote for it in any case. That is probably true, but still there would be open discussion on it and the people would know something of what was being proposed and would have a chance to register either protest or agreement before the thing is undertaken. In other words, the people do not desire to transfer the power of the Legislature to any government or any dictator.

It is true that a government may by order-in-council carry through details of a principle which has received the endorsation of parliament, and when parliament is not in session. But for a government to take to itself the power to deal with all the principles which might be involved in the implementing of a Social Credit policy and without referring each phase of it in the form of a bill to be passed by the Legislature, is a departure from democratic principles which is unwarranted and dangerous.

Ii Duce has just suppressed the chamber of deputies. There's an idea for you. If you don't need the Legislature on a matter as important as Social Credit, you can do without the Legislature entirely. That will probably be your next step. Once that is done you will have no more disagreeable questions from the opposition, no troublesome caucuses and you would save the expenses of the members' indemnities and of the sessions.

Let me retrace with you the steps you have taken from your school room to your present position.

You told the people of Alberta that you believed in Social Credit, that it could be applied in the province despite either the constitution or bankers' influence. On that issue you gained the confidence of the electorate and became premier. You refused to have Major Douglas as your advisor, although you had previously avowed that he would be the man you would engage. He then offered to serve the province without fees. You refused, while you put on a public show to convey the idea that it is Major Douglas' own fault that he is not here. Then you engaged Mr. Magor who drew up a bondholders' budget. You accepted that budget though it perpetuates the debt-creating system, increases the taxation burden and reduces the purchasing power of the people which you were elected to increase. Then, to make a pretence at moving a step toward Social Credit after you had gone a hundred miles away from it, you brought in the so-called Social Credit measure. It merely authorized the appointment of a commission to investigate Social Credit. Your followers were stunned and disillusioned when they read its meaningless clauses and your opponents mocked it with laughter. Driven to desperation by the importunity of your following you decided to redeem the bill in their opinions. So you add in the usual legal jargon that if the investigation reveals that "something" can be done, the government will have the power to do it without further consulting the Legislature.

I do not fear what may be done as the result of that amendment. I hazard a guess that nothing will be done. But the people have lost something of vital importance to democracy in your amendment. That is the thing that matters. Your amendment is the thin edge of the fascist wedge. You may have different intentions; the fact is that you have adopted fascist principles.

Take my advice as a friendly opponent and don't do it, Mr. Premier. We may all tolerate your doing nothing, as we have tolerated other governments, but we can't stand for you doing something that is worse than doing nothing. I must protest strongly against your reactionary, liberty-destroying legislation. I protest against this act of fascism even though it should bring some compensating sop which I have no hope that it will bring. I protest against any curtailment of the rights of the people because it is only by using the little liberty we have that we can gain the greater economic liberty we desire. In taking away part of that liberty from the representatives of the people you will do more harm than all the good which the most sanguine anticipate from your regime.

You are fascist in everything but two things. You have limited constitutional power, thank God, in which to exercise your fascistic tendencies, and you lack the particular gifts of a real dictator.

No doubt your ability is as great as my own or of that of any other ordinary man. It, however, requires extraordinary ability to be a successful dictator. The greatest opponents of fascism will be forced to admit the ability of Mussolini and Hitler, as well as that of Lenin and Stalin, dictators with a different objective.

So you had better not go any further in that direction. Your fascist tendencies make you enjoy dictating. Don't let these tendencies betray you into thinking yourself a real dictator.

Sincerely yours,
WM. IRVINE.

HON. WM. ABERHART, B.A., April 11, 1936.
Premier of Alberta.

Dear Sir:

You were elected to change the financial system and abolish poverty. As leader of a provincial government both these desirable ambitions are beyond your power.

If you have not discovered that yet you no doubt will do so very shortly.

Most of my communications to you have been in connection with those subjects. I now propose to write you a few letters about things that you can do and which, if you do, will not only assist the people of Alberta to carry their economic burden, but will be definite steps toward the ultimate abolition of poverty.

The source of all Alberta's wealth, past, present, or to come, is her natural resources.

Constitutionally, Alberta has control of her resources, and nominally she owns them. But you are aware, no doubt, that much of our boasted ownership is political rhetoric.

The fact is that much of our natural resources have been given away to corporations and privileged individuals by the Liberal party for political reasons. Particularly the coal fields, the oil and gas fields and our water power. These are the sources of power, which if held by the government, would furnish cheap power for the new industries which you had hopes of establishing in this province, and of which you and your followers spoke fluently and promisingly during the election campaign. There were to be woolen mills in Edmonton and factories for farm machinery in almost every riding, not to mention all the other manufacturing projects which were to make Alberta independent of the East.

I suggest to you that you should adopt at once as a policy that no further natural resources shall be given or sold to any person or corporation and that one by one as you are in a position to do it, you recapture for Alberta the resources which have been alienated, beginning with the oil and gas and water power.

The means of power becomes more and more important as we move into a highly mechanized age. Even now it is not one of the least of a farmer's worries to obtain gasoline and oil for his tractor. In many instances it is impossible. Gasoline and oil are milked from the bowels of the earth. They are products of Nature. They belong to all the people. They are part of the heritage of which you had so much to say a few months ago. Very well, let us enjoy our heritage. Take over all the gas and oil resources of Alberta and produce these necessities to modern industry for the use of the people instead of for the profit of the monopolist.

If you can practice Social Credit in this province at all, this would be a splendid place to begin. You should take over the holdings without any remuneration whatever and appraise the plant equipment of the companies at replacement value. Then enter the amount of that replacement value to the credit of the present operators in the ledger of your provincial credit house and permit them to check against their credit account for the purchase of goods sold in Alberta and to continue to do so until their credit is exhausted. This process will mean in the last analysis that the people of Alberta have exchanged the products of their labor for the equipment of oil wells and oil refineries.

Real wealth is the basis of "fountain pen" money. Get control of our natural resources as the basis of your proposed credit system and while you are doing so, don't forget that the people of Alberta can be, and are being, exploited as much by the so-called owners of our oil and gasoline as by those who claim ownership of our credit.

I shall have more to say on these and other matters in subsequent letters. And please note that this is not criticism in the sense in which I have criticised your failure in respect to the credit issue. These are constructive and practical suggestions made in a friendly attitude, and they are being made solely in the interest of Alberta.

Sincerely yours,
WM. IRVINE.

HON. WM. ABERHART, B.A., April 18, 1936.
Premier of Alberta.

Dear Sir:

Your first session of the Legislature has ended. Your responsibilities have been heavy and you have worked hard. Like every other premier you have had to face some difficult situations which were not of your making, but which were the result of many and varied conditions converging at a point in time where you happened to be. It is the ability of men to meet such situations that mark them as great or small.

You are now to take a trip to the coast for a rest. I hope that you will enjoy that short reprieve from the confinements and onerousness of your responsibilities, and return to your duties refreshed and with renewed strength.

It may happen that this letter may reach you during your few days of rest, and that it may suggest to your mind the course of action to be taken in respect to the matter of public health with which it is chiefly concerned. You will recall that in my last letter I suggested a policy in regard to our natural resources. That was to retain for the province all natural resources which have not been already disposed of in some way to individuals, and to recapture those which have been alienated as quickly as is practicable, beginning at once with the oil, gas and water power. In this letter I desire to put forward the idea of socialized health services.

As a matter of principle you will no doubt agree that it is as sound and logical to socialize the services which take care of human bodies as it is to socialize those services which take care of the human mind. Our school system which might be said to be services to the mind have long been socialized. Our public schools are open to every man's child without charges to the individual pupils. Hospitals, clinics, and all sorts of medical services should be accessible to every one on a basis similar to that of the public school. And that is what I suggest that you should do for the people of Alberta as speedily as possible.

You will not regard it as unfriendly when I remind you that you were very neglectful of public health in your first budget. The grant to blind and deaf children was reduced. The travelling clinic, which was the first tiny step toward the socialization of health services, was almost wiped out by a two-third reduction in financial assistance.

Now, I want you to go far beyond the travelling clinic idea. I want the provincial government to become responsible for the entire health services of all the people of the province; free hospitals, free medical examination, free medicine.

There are very few actual cures for any of the many diseases which inflict humanity. In most cases the body fights it out with what assistance doctors and nurses can give. But the preventive side of the question is of vast importance. Free clinics in every community would do much to prevent many of the diseases which kill the older people before their time, and in cases where disease cannot be prevented the proper diagnosis and treatment given in time would mitigate suffering and extend the span of life. Clinics for children and young people would guard against diseases from malnutrition, decaying teeth, tonsils, adenoids and the like and give every youth a chance to meet the battle for health on a reasonable basis.

Then, what is the use of a doctor's prescription which cannot be secured? If a doctor tells a patient that he or she should go to the hospital for two weeks' rest and observation and the patient has no money, or if he prescribes drugs of an expensive sort which cannot be bought, what then?

You will agree, I'm sure, that not only must we have free doctors, and free clinics, but free hospitals and free medicine. The health of the community is not only one of the greatest economic assets, but the worth of life to the individual and the community is measured in a large part by the degree of health enjoyed.

Moreover, in regard to diseases that are contagious and infectious, one individual whose case is neglected may contaminate a community. So that from every point of view the health of the community is properly a government responsibility in so far as the diagnosing and treatment of diseases are concerned, as well as in matters of hygiene, diet and health education.

So, Mr. Premier, I believe that in asking you to socialize our health services I am speaking for the great majority of the people in Alberta, which, of course, includes your own following.

Don't ask me where the money is to come from? You are the one man who knew that a few months ago. Don't tell me that you don't know how to get the money. You knew how to collect nine millions to pay interest to bondholders. Is it any more difficult to collect that much for the health and lives of our own people?

After I have presented for your consideration other matters of public importance, which I believe to be practical and within your jurisdictional powers, I shall write you more fully on the details of the various proposals. Meanwhile, I want you to think of socialized health services for Alberta.

Sincerely yours,
WM. IRVINE.

HON. WM. ABERHART, B.A., April 25, 1936.
Premier of Alberta.

Dear Sir:

I do hope that my letters to you give you as much pleasure to read as they give me to write. I have been suggesting to you certain constructive

things which I hope you will undertake. So far I have urged you to retain all natural resources now held by the province, to take over the oil and gas fields and operate them for the people, and to inaugurate a public health service which will be within the reach of every citizen and as free as the public school. Today I want to say something to you about education.

Of course education is your specialty and it is therefore with some diffidence that I address you on that subject. First let me say that your actions on educational matters since you came into office have been progressive, and you are to be congratulated on three specific things. You have assisted the teachers to complete their organization so that professionally they will have some protection; you have moved toward the establishment of larger administrative units, and you have openly condemned McGibbon's antiquated economics. These are all to the good and I extend praise to you for having done these things just as readily as I have criticized you for what you have not done.

Now, Sir, with regard to the technique of pedagogics I would not think of offering any views to a man of your experience, but there are one or two phases of the educational problem upon which I desire to comment. The one is a matter of administrative justice, the other philosophic.

As to the first, it is, that means must be found to afford children of rural schools the same opportunity for higher education as is the privilege of city children. The larger administrative units is the first step in that direction, but perhaps it will be necessary to do more than enlarge the unit. That step will probably improve the equipment and provide opportunity for the higher grades, but it will create a problem of distances for the pupils which may have to be overcome by some other policy.

But what about the present practice of driving almost all students down the same old beaten track of academics? There must be a more rational and practical development of the vocational idea. Why should a girl who has little aptitude for higher mathematics and history waste her time with such subjects which she will never put to practical use, when she might excel in domestic economy? Or why should a boy, who should be studying some branch of mechanics or of agriculture waste his time with Latin? I raise these practical questions to you because they lead directly to the philosophy which underlies education and to which I desire to invite your thought.

The chief objective of modern education would appear to be still to make academic scholars. Such courses still hold the prestige so that a boy who is studying how to build an engine or to raise chickens would have a feeling of inferiority as compared to a B.A.

Now, Mr. Premier, and Minister of Education, I appeal to you to find a worthwhile purpose for education, to state clearly what that purpose is and to remodel the whole educational system of Alberta accordingly.

Look at the curriculum, say, of high school students. What is the purpose behind that course? If there is any at all it is the one which had its birth at the time of the renaissance.

Education should surely be a preparation for life; not for a life that is past and not for one to come, but for the life which is. During that process of education there is taking place the development or upholding of the mental powers of the student on the one hand, and there are the realities of life for which he should be in some measure prepared by his education to face.

The capitalistic philosophy now is the basis of our educational system. And we find that the education based on that philosophy is as far from meeting the requirements of modern life as the capitalists are from solving the problem of unemployment.

An educated Indian youth at a time prior to the coming of the white man, would have been able to meet any condition which his life demanded. He could build and handle a canoe and he could make and use his bow and arrows. He could shoot a rapid or shoot a buffalo. He could make his own tools and weapons, scalp his enemies or in short take his part in whatever his life demanded.

Surely a modern educational system should fit modern youth as adequately to meet the requirements of their more complicated life as the education of a North American Indian fitted him to his life.

An educationist lecturing on this subject shortly ago and referring to the change which the industrial revolution brought said: "Life was real for the child in those days (pre-industrial). His vocational school was the home. He learned the domestic arts and skills from his parents and neighbors by contact with real situations. All he required to know in addition was how to sign his name, keep accounts and read a few books. This the little red schoolhouse with its training in the three R's provided."

But what of our world now at the other end of the industrial revolution? We are living now in an interdependent world in which the narrow individualism of the pre-industrial period is not only ignorant, it is dangerous. What we need is a philosophy of co-operation as the basis of our educational system and then alterations of curriculum and technique to follow in keeping with it. A capitalist who in his business pays starvation wages and then starts a charity drive for undernourished children is an example of miseducation.

Of course the benefits of education are limited by economic circumstances. I suggest that when you have reorganized the educational system of Alberta on a co-operative philosophy, that you take such steps as will lead to a condition under which no child in Alberta will be denied educational advantages for lack of the economic requirements.

Sincerely yours,
WM. IRVINE.

HON. WM. ABERHART, B.A., May 2, 1936.
Premier of Alberta.

Dear Sir:

Time moves on. Another week has gone. You have returned from your holiday and will be expecting my letter. Well, here it is. I have been tempted to write about your talk of abolishing unemployment in the next two months and of the rumors about your intention to try out scrip or some other device in connection with the Dominion public works program. But I have decided that these things can wait for another week or so.

I am writing today to ask you to consider a policy which your predecessors in office flatly refused to countenance, though I urged it on them times without number. The refusal of the previous government to consider this policy, by the way, is not its only recommendation. I shall deal with its merits as well as I can in a short letter.

You must be aware that paying for land is perhaps the greatest of all hardships on our farmers. Most of the land now being farmed was bought from retiring homesteaders or else from land companies. Buyers undertook to pay for that land. A small payment down was the usual thing and the rest became a mortgage at a high rate of interest.

Now land is bought and sold, as a rule, only when prices are high. Land prices are high when wheat prices are up, or when there is an influx of affluent immigrants. Let us suppose that a farmer bought a half section of land when wheat was over a dollar a bushel, and that he undertook to pay $40.00 per acre for that land. He pays $800.00 cash down and assumes a mortgage for $12,000 at 7 per cent interest. I think that in most cases it would have been 8 per cent interest. The next year his crop is frozen and he can't even pay the interest, so the price of his land mounts to $12,840, or $40.00 more than it was at the beginning. Then the next year wheat drops to 50 cents per bushel, what chance has that farmer got to pay for that land?

Some few do succeed by very hard work, good management, good luck and frugal living to eventually pay off the mortgage. By that time their lives are about through and they find that they have actually paid $24,000 for the land originally priced at $12,800. But many others drop off at various stages. Some never get past their first payment, others pay for years and finally give up the fight, broken financially and in spirit.

This goes on from one generation to another. All the farmers are always paying for land, but very few ever succeed in doing it. I know a piece of land occupied now by its sixth owner. Not one of them ever managed to pay for it, but they all paid some, so that taken together they had paid for it twice over and yet the last in the struggle still had two-thirds of the original price to pay and I am sure he will never pay it.

Now to suggest a new land policy, I know is terrible. We are told that all farmers by instinct just love to spend their lives working for mortgage companies, that the uncertainty of their tenure is the zest of life and that they would not change the system for any consideration whatsoever. That may be so. Anyhow I am not going to propose a policy in respect to those lands already sold. I think the farmers of Alberta should decide their own land policy by plebiscite or otherwise. Personally, I am convinced that the money they pay for land is money wasted even if they succeed in paying off the bill, which 75 per cent of them will never do. When a farmer defaults, mortgage companies exult.

Here is a story from Australia which may help to make the situation clear if the time ever comes when farmers want to change the present system. In Australia, they have a perpetual lease system which applies to all land held by the crown, but lands alienated prior to the lease policy may still be bought and sold. So one Australian farmer took out a perpetual lease for a certain acreage of land. Close by a friend of his about the same age and as good a farmer, refused the lease system and bought a farm exactly the same acreage as that held by his friend under the lease system. The price was the equivalent of $15,000. He paid $3,000 down and of course, assumed the mortgage for the balance.

Scene two is twenty years later. The man who bought the land paid the last payment when he was on his deathbed, and when he totaled up all that he had paid he found it came to $30,000, and the land at that moment could not have been sold for $7,000. The lease-hold man on the other hand had enjoyed absolute security of tenure throughout the 20 years. When

he sold his wheat he put the money in the bank to his own credit, whereas his land-buying friend put his wheat money to the credit of the mortgage company. So that at the twenty years end the lease-hold farmer had $25,000 cash in the bank and besides he and his family had lived during the 20 years. They had gone for trips, bought books, radios, pianos and cars. There is the story.

But I have taken too much time to tell you this story so I shall have to postpone my actual proposal of a new land policy for Alberta to my next letter. That policy will be in respect to lands now held by the province, and will affect lands held for speculative purposes. But, as I have said, as long as farmers want to slave to pay mortgage companies, that is their business.

The thing which I believe every farmer and every man wants is security of tenure on that part of the earth on which he makes his living. The present system gives nothing but slavery and insecurity.

I shall next week suggest a policy which will give security while at the same time the product of a farmer's labors will accrue to himself rather than to mortgage companies.

I might first remind you in closing that if the Dominion government is going to spend a million dollars on public works in Alberta, and Alberta puts up dollar for dollar, that will be two million. Under the credit flow theory you preached before the election, that would build $24,000,000 worth of highways. That is worth remembering, it seems to me.

Sincerely yours,
WM. IRVINE.

HON. WM. ABERHART, B.A., May 9, 1936.
Premier of Alberta.
Dear Sir:

This has been rather a trying week. Your new tax came into operation. As you will have gathered, it is very unpopular. Of course, no tax which people are aware of is ever welcome, but a sales tax is a nuisance any way and a double nuisance in a province. Then you should not have proclaimed the Act until you knew what you were doing. Even if you had left the details of its administration to have been worked out by the departmental officials they would have done it efficiently. As it was, nobody did it. Nobody seemed to know anything about it, and confusion and bewilderment characterized its introduction.

You may not have noticed it, but an Act of that sort is not just like passing a resolution at a public meeting. An Act has to be worked out in detail and applied and somebody must work it out. It simply will not work itself out. However, the people will forgive the incompetence on the ground that your government is composed of amateurs. And there are worse things than amateurs. The sales tax itself is worse.

But I must get to the new land policy for Alberta of which my last letter to you was an introduction. A policy which is too drastic is not easy to apply nor would it be likely to be acceptable to the people. But it is essential, nevertheless, that the policy adopted should be one which will meet in a practical way the immediate problem of farmers who are likely to be put out of their homes for debt in the next few years, and which at the same time will lead to an intelligent and comprehensive solution of the land problem of the province.

I suggest that you begin by taking the first step, which is to make it a policy of your government that from now henceforth all the lands held by the province shall continue to be held by it. That neither homesteads nor leases on the old basis will be given and that not an acre shall be sold to any one.

The second step is to tax large landholding companies, including mortgage companies, so high that they will be forced either to put their land to productive uses or get rid of it. If this were done much of the best of Alberta's lands would be returned and would become the property of the commonwealth.

The third step, and the one which is essential to be taken in the interests of debt-ridden farmers, is that when a farmer has been ejected by a mortgage company you should at once grant him a perpetual lease of land belonging to the province.

No one knows better than you that the farmers cannot pay their debts under the present system. You should also know now that you cannot as premier of this province change the whole economic system of Canada and the world. But you do have power to change our land policy in such a way as to insure security of tenure for our farming population. Would it not be better to try doing something which you have full power to do than to waste your time and bring the province into even more difficulty by trying to do what you are not permitted to do under the constitution?

In any case I have no objection to you trying to do anything even if you can't do it, if you will try and do this practical thing. As I have said, you know that the farmers of Alberta are no more able to pay their debts and the interest on them than you are able to pay the provincial debt. Yet you passed legislation last session which weakened the protective position which the farmers held as a result of the legislation of the previous government. That legislation was at best negative.

The perpetual lease idea is not original. It is a policy now in practice in Australia. In reply to a letter sent to the Director of Lands in Australia in 1932, he said:

"In regard to your letter seeking information about the system of perpetual leases in this state, I have to inform you that the system has been a distinct success in South Australia and at the present time an area of 15,564,521 acres is held under perpetual lease conditions. A perpetual lease is considered to be a definite security of tenure for genuine landholders."

If you are interested, I suggest that you set about obtaining all information in this regard. Get the South Australian Crown Lands Act of 1929, and the annual reports of the Department of Lands, especially the one for 1931-32.

If a perpetual lease were granted to each farmer who will be put off his land by mortgage companies during the coming years, that in itself would check the ardour of those who desire to foreclose. But the greatest advantage would be that it would give the farmers security of tenure which they have failed to achieve under the present system. Under a perpetual lease a farmer would enjoy security as long as he lived and would pass on his lease to his successors who would also have security of tenure. A farmer may die today and pass on a clear deed to his family, but in five years the land he thought was his may be in the name of a mortgage company.

Applying this policy at the beginning only to farmers who have been dispossessed or to young men who may desire to go farming, will afford an opportunity to test the policy by gradual stages and it will not interfere with the private ownership of those farmers who have either completed the payments for their land or are still in hopes of doing so.

Our farmers must be brought out of debt. They must have security of tenure. This policy paves the way to both. If you have a better policy to accomplish these ends let's hear what it is. The problems are there. They must be solved. This policy will help solve them. I commend it for your serious consideration.

Sincerely yours,
WM. IRVINE.

HON. WM. ABERHART, B.A., May 23, 1936.
Premier of Alberta.
Dear Sir:

You are off to Ottawa again with three of your ministers. The travelling expenses of Ministers is, no doubt, a small matter comparatively. Still it does seem to me that you should have had all refunding plans ready before hand and made your arrangements with the Federal government when you were at the Inter-Provincial Conference. If your plans were not ready at that time, surely they could have been ready for Hon. Mr. Cockroft, who just returned from Ottawa last week.

Of course it is not clear to your friends why you should have to go to Ottawa at all. It is perfectly clear to me however, because I knew many years ago that a provincial government could not control the volume either of currency or credit. But all those people who believed you when you said that Alberta had full control over financial policy must wonder why you and your Ministers have to make so many trips to Ottawa.

Do you remember your letter to Major Douglas on September 24th, 1935. He had written you in regard to a proposed Loan Council. You said in reply: "The suggestion of Prime Minister Bennett to form a Loan Council is a matter of small moment when you bear in mind that the provinces have full autonomy of their own credit". Well, why don't you bear that in mind now? If the Loan Council is of such small concern, why not stay in Edmonton and proceed with your refinancing, always bearing in mind that you have full autonomy?

The refunding of debt has become a major consideration of your government. Social Credit has been forgotten and you have entered upon a thoroughly orthodox procedure. Of course, every one agrees that refunding at a lower rate of interest is not only desirable, but is a necessity. It is a necessity to the continuation of capitalism. Every province must refund. The Dominion government must refund its debts also. Bondholders are anxious to refund, because only in that way can the system be continued. No wonder Major Douglas suggested that you had entered a trap of the financiers.

Debt refunding on the old basis is neither a part of a Social Credit program, nor is it essential to the introduction of Social Credit.

I would draw your attention to the fundamental difference in viewpoint between yourself and Major Douglas on this matter. You are anxious to dabble in some plan or scheme, while Major Douglas wanted first to gain control of the source of credit supply. You recall his illustration

about the car. In his letter to you he said: "You appear to consider that the problem in Alberta may be compared to the provision of an improved automobile, while I have consistently endeavored to make it clear that there is a monopoly of gasoline." So you are off to Ottawa to try to make some alteration on the old car of debt, while you should have been trying to tap the source of gasoline supply.

You appear to think that if you refund $160,000,000 by converting into perpetual bonds at 2.75 per cent, that you will be doing a great thing. Just what will you be doing? Perpetual bonds are the most ideal invention imaginable for the bondholding class. To give a man a perpetual bond is like giving a dairy farmer a milking cow which never grows old, never goes dry and milks the maximum forever. Perpetual bonds mean the perpetual enslavement of the people to those few who collect interest on them.

Ah, but you say, interest will be reduced to 2.75 per cent and it will be 30 years at least before we even think of paying any of the principal. But $160,000,000, at 2.75 per cent interest compounded for 30 years will mean that the people of Alberta will have paid the whole $160,000,000 by the end of 30 years and will still owe the entire amount of the debt.

Of course, I can understand how you are striving desperately to do something since you discovered that you could not do what you promised to do before the election. But refunding, even at a lower rate of interest, will not let you out, because the premiers of the other provinces who are not interested in Social Credit will probably complete their refinancing ahead of you and on better terms. Refunding debt and increasing security to the bondholders, cannot be regarded as being essentially a Social Credit policy. If so, then other governments such as Australia and Great Britain are Social Credit, since they have refunded long ago. Saskatchewan and British Columbia will have to be considered Social Credit also if refunding be an act essential to Social Credit.

There is only one man who might be presumed to know how to refund under a Social Credit regime and that is the author of Social Credit. At least it will be admitted that if the author of Social Credit does not know what a Social Credit government should do in these matters, then no one else does know. Well, what did the Major advise?

Away back last September, in fact, just two days after you assumed office, Major Douglas advised you in regard to providing for the immediate financial needs of the province. He suggested asking a private bank to create $5,000,000 in credit to the province with a fountain pen. If the province has as much control over its credit as you thought, why was this not done? Instead you borrow from the Dominion.

Later Major Douglas advised you how a Social Crediter should meet the maturing obligations now in default. This advice you ignored also.

Now, Sir, I believe that either you or Major Douglas is ignorant of Social Credit. Which of the two do you think it is? Time will tell.

Sincerely yours,
WM. IRVINE.

That's the same dope all the other doctors have been giving me. I thought you had some wonderful cure-all.
So I have, so I have! But I won't give you that till you fully recover.
ORTHODOX FINANCE
DOC. ABERHART
ALBERTA